| Question # | Question Reference Section | Question | Answer |
|---------------|---|--|---|
| 1 | Attachment 1: Cover Letter | Where should additional partners (i.e. community based organizations/ private organizations) be listed as they don't fall under either of the two classifications categories provided- "Additional Counties and/or City Mental Health/ Behavioral Health Departments" or "School Districts." | Additional partners should be listed on ATTACHMENT 2 under the line: "List all school districts and educational partner entities (Add lines as needed)" |
| 2 | Attachment 11: Budget Worksheet | Will applicants receive additional points for providing a match? Or alternately, be penalized for not including a match? | Additional points are not added for matching funds. Applicants will not be penalized for not including matching funds. |
| 3 | Attachment 14: Triage Hiring Report | Please confirm that Attachment 14 is for post- award reporting and is not to be included in the grant application. | ATTACHMENT 14 is post-award and is not to be included in the grant application. |
| 4 | ATTACHMENT 3: School-County Collaborative | Who is considered "county"? | For the purposes of this RFA, a "county" refers to a county or city mental health/behavioral health department. |
| 5 | ATTACHMENT 3: School-County Collaborative | Is a County Office of Education considered "county"? | No. See answer to question 4. |
| 6 | ATTACHMENT 3: School-County Collaborative | Is a County Office of Education considered "school"? | A County Office of Education may be considered an "educational entity." |
| 7 | SECTION I: Key Action Dates | Will information from the Bidder's Conference be shared to all potential applicants who submit a Letter of Intent? | There is no information from the Bidder's Conference to share. Participants were asked to submit all verbal questions in writing for an official response. Those questions and answers are included in this document which will be published on the Commission's website. http://mhsoca.ca.gov/node/1006 |

| Question # | Question Reference Section | Question | Answer |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | Additionally, the contact person listed on the Letter of Intent will be notified of the publication |
| 8 | SECTION I: Key dates | Was the Bidders' Conference recorded, and where can I find it? | The Bidders' Conference was not recorded, however, all written questions submitted with official answers are provided on the website: http://mhsoac.ca.gov/node/1006 |
| 9 | SECTION I: Key dates | If the contract award is May 2018, should we project a June 1,2018 start date for grant purposes? | Contract award is scheduled for May 2018, but still must be executed/signed by the grantee and the Commission before work can begin. Contracts for this grant must be executed/signed by June 30, 2018. |
| 10 | SECTION III: Purpose and Goals | Could the Commission please explain if there are any expectations around providing Medi-Cal billable services, or focusing on strictly Medi-Cal or Medi-Cal eligible youth? | There are no expectations related to Medi-cal. |
| 11 | SECTION III: Purpose & Goals | As we address pre-K and the very diverse funding and availability of programs, are there any preferences or restrictions in the community organization types to be included in addition to LEA/District-operated preschool and parenting programs? Are we allowed to concentrate in pre-K triage and services with linkages to the existing services through grade 3 and above, or must the proposal be inclusive of preschool through grade 3? | The Commission has no preference on the type of collaborative partners the applicant chooses to partner with as long as they are in line with the purpose and goals of the RFA. The RFA states an emphasis on prekindergarten through third grade, but is available for all children in prekindergarten through twelfth grade. The proposal does not have to be inclusive of pre-K through grade 3. |

| Question # | Question Reference Section | Question | Answer |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 12 | SECTION V.A: Eligibility Criteria | We are applying as a lead nonprofit organization in San Diego County, with the affirmative support and collaboration of the San Diego County Department of behavioral Health, in lieu of the County directly receiving funds. The RFA instructions are not clear on how we should proceed as a community-based organization (CBO), as they are only written for County applicants. Are you looking for a School/CBO collaborative instead of a School/County collaborative? Or should we apply as a School/County/CBO collaborative? We have a number of County-funded Behavioral Health contracts that we provide in school sites and in partnership with the school districts. | An addendum was issued to address this issue. See Addendum 1 on the MHSOAC website under the School-County Collaborate RFA: http://mhsoac.ca.gov/node/1006. Also see Addendum 2 issued with this set of questions and responses. |
| 13 | SECTION V.A: Eligibility Criteria | Can the County/Mental Health Plan (MHP) provide a letter of support to school districts or a local County Office of Education to apply for the grant vs. the County/MHP applying and needing to be the recipient of the grant? If so, should the County/MHP be the one to submit the Letter of Intent or the school district? | Addendum 1 addressed this issue. All changes in Addendum 1 were incorporated into Addendum 2. See addendum 2 for all current requirements. |

| Question # | Question Reference Section | Question | Answer |
|---------------|--|--|---|
| 14 | SECTION V.E: Allowable Costs | Does the 15% limit on administrative costs include a Project Director/ Coordinator role? Or can that position be funded as Triage Personnel? | All triage personnel must meet the requirements stated in the RFA. Any other costs would fall under administrative. |
| 15 | SECTION V: Grant Application | If the San Diego County Behavioral Health Dept. supports the collaboration with SDCOE and our Funding project, would then the SDCOE be able to directly receive the grant funds and be the administrator of the grant? | An addendum was issued to address this issue. See Addendum 1 on the MHSOAC website under the School-County Collaborate RFA: http://mhsoac.ca.gov/node/1006 |
| 16 | SECTION V: Grant Application and Funding - E. Allowable Costs | Can any of the funding be used to purchase equipment and/or materials (i.e computers; office supplies; public awareness or training supplies)? | This is a personnel services grant. Per RFA section V.E.1. administrative costs are allowed up to 15 percent of the grant for any administrative costs associated with partners, contracted personnel, operating costs, and travel to check-in meetings. This also includes equipment and/or materials. |
| 17 | SECTION VI.B.1 - VI.B.2: Evidence of Established Collaborative - Scored Qualifications | It appears that three types of agreements are required for the application. Is this correct? See below:(1) Pg. 7, B1b- Agreements dated two years prior demonstrating collaboration(2) Pg. 7, B1c- Current agreements showing that the collaboration is still in existence(3) Pg. 7, B2a.i Agreement verifying the beginning of the collaborative. | The identified agreements are required. |
| 18 | SECTION VI.B.1: Eligibility Criteria | To fulfill this requirement would a letter of intent in support of the grant application suffice or does | A letter of intent in support of the grant application does not fulfill the requirement. |

| Question # | Question Reference Section | Question | Answer |
|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | it need to be an executed agreement? "Attach a current MOU, service agreement, or other agreement between the school-county formalizing the collaboration showing that the collaboration is still in existence," | |
| 19 | SECTION VI.B.1: Evidence of Established Collaborative | "Attach an MOU, service agreement, or other agreement. formalizing the collaboration." Our clinicians have been providing clinical services to students at more than 60 school locations for years. These locations are considered satellite locations for which we can provide Medi-Cal reimbursed services without an MOU or service agreement requirement. If we can confirm this with a letter from each school district, would that provide sufficient documentation supporting school-county collaboration? | All requirements need to be met to support a school-county collaboration. See Addendum 2 for a definition of a school-county collaborative. The supporting documentation must be some type of formal agreement, such as a MOU, service agreement, etc. which the school and county have signed and shows a date of when the collaboration was established. |
| 20 | SECTION VI.B.1: Evidence of Established Collaborative | Could the Commission please clarify and define school-county collaborative? Can the established collaboratives be on a school-to-county individual basis or is the Commission looking for an established larger collaborative? | See Addendum 2 for a definition a school-county collaborative. |
| 21 | SECTION VI.B.2.a. Scored Qualifications | Are meeting minutes (with attendance) sufficient to establish the existence of | No. Per RFA section VI.B.2.a., the supporting documentation must be some type of formal agreement, such as a MOU, service agreement, etc. |

| Question # | Question Reference Section | Question | Answer |
|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | a collaborative partnership? | which the school and county have signed and shows a date of when the collaboration was established. Additionally, documentation must be submitted to verify that the school-county collaborative partnership still exists today. Meeting minutes with a recent date may be provided to verify that the partnership exists today. |
| 22 | SECTION VI.C.1.1: Plan Timeline | Should the timeline document other grant activities such as those listed in Attachment 6 (Trainings supports), Attachment'10 (Communication), etc.? | Only the requirements identified in section VI.C.1 need to be included. |
| 23 | SECTION VI.C.1: Implementation Plan | What differentiates the information requested about "recruitment strategy" in these two sections? | VI.C.1.a is the narrative. VI.C.1.1 is the timeline. |
| 24 | SECTION VII. Statewide Evaluation | "Grantees shall employ staff through the grant for triage data gathering and to submit relevant data to the Evaluation Contractor. Participation in the statewide evaluation is mandatory. "Would these staff be considered triage personnel or part of the administration 15%?? | Staff hired for "triage data gathering" are considered administrative. |
| 25 | SECTION VII: Statewide Evaluation | Would the staff hired for "triage data gathering" be listed in the budget under "Hire triage staff' or would the role be considered administrative? | Staff hired for "triage data gathering" are considered administrative. |
| 26 | SECTION X: Application Assembly and | Does the no limit on number of pages also apply to all attachments/ appendices, as well as the program narrative and | There is no limit on the number of pages for the entire application. The length of application responses from the original 2013 RFA is not relevant |

| Question | Question | Question | Anower |
|----------|---|---|--|
| # | Reference Section | Question | Answer |
| | Submission Instructions | other components of the grant, such as the budget narrative? Given there is no limitation on the number of pages the proposal narrative can be, what was the range of the proposal responses in number of pages of the narrative, or the average or median length of proposals received, for the original 2013 RFA? | because this is a separate procurement with different requirements. |
| 27 | SECTION X: Application Assembly and Submission Instructions | In our County, proposals to competitive solicitations are public documents, and actual proposals submitted are subject to being requested for viewing by the public. Is that also the case for MHSOAC proposals? May we request to view proposals that were submitted in 2013? | The proposals submitted in 2013 are public records and you may request to view them. However, the 2013 procurement did not include a School-County Collaborative. This type of grant is new and was not offered in 2013 procurement. |
| 28 | SECTION X: Application Assembly and Submission Instructions | Are there word counts for the responses to each section? | No. Mandatory templates have been provided as attachments in the RFA. The templates will expand to accommodate answers. Margins are not to be adjusted on the templates. |
| 29 | SECTION X: Application Assembly and Submission Instructions | Are there page limits to any of the sections? | No. There is no limit on the number of pages for the entire application. Mandatory templates have been provided as attachments in the RFA. The templates will expand to accommodate answers. Margins are not to be adjusted on the templates. |
| 30 | SECTION X: Application Assembly and Submission Instructions | Is there a word or character count limit? Or total Narrative section of number of pages limit? | No. See answers to questions 26, 28, and 29. |

| Question # | Question Reference Section | Question | Answer |
|---------------|--|---|---|
| 31 | SECTION: VI.B.3.b: Proposed Plan Scoring Table | "Monthly activities and milestones" language or chart is not included in the Attachment 5 template on page 36 under "Describe the Plan." Is it permissible to add our own chart to the template? | This scoring table has been updated with the correct requirement. See Addendum 2 for corrected scoring table. http://mhsoac.ca.gov/node/1006 |
| 32 | SECTION: VI.B.3.b: Proposed Plan | This language is not available in the Attachment 5 template on pages 35-38: "What is the inter-agency collaboration communications plan?" | See Addendum 2 on the MHSOAC website under the School-County Collaborate RFA: http://mhsoac.ca.gov/node/1006 for updated Table XI – points available per requirement, information |
| 33 | SECTION: VI.B.3.b: Proposed Plan | "How would you measure the increase in services and/or outcomes?" Should a response to this question be related to the communication plan under which it is listed (8.3.d. on page 37) or instead is it related to 8.3.c. (on page 37)? | The response should relate to how any increase in services and/or outcomes resulted from an inter-agency communications plan would be measured. See Addendum 2 on the MHSOAC website under the School-County Collaborate RFA for the corrected template: http://mhsoac.ca.gov/node/1006 |
| 34 | SECTION: VI.B.2.a.ii.1: Scored Qualifications | This language is not available to provide a response in the Attachment 4 template, starting on page 29: "Indicate whether this existing school-county collaborative includes prekindergarten through third graders | See Addendum 2 on the MHSOAC website under the School-County Collaborate RFA: http://mhsoac.ca.gov/node/1006 for updated Table XI – points available per requirement, information |